

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,868	02/23/2004	Enrique Travieso	074869-0015	9488
	7590 10/29/200 WILL & EMERY LL	EXAMINER		
600 13TH STREET, N.W.			AL HASHEMI, SANA A	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			AH)		
·		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summer		10/784,868	TRAVIESO ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ti. MAN 1100 DATE 1100	Sana Al-Hashemi	2164		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	he correspondence address		
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply but apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS and a specification to become ABANDIC cause the application to become ABANDIC.	TON. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•		•		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 A</u>	ugust 2007.			
		action is non-final.			
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E				
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)🖂	Claim(s) 57-93 is/are pending in the application	٦.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) <u>57-93</u> is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
440	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Off	fice Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		cation No.		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior				
	application from the International Bureau	- -	ū		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rece	eived.		
Attachmen	t(s)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ			
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform	il Date al Patent Application		
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Patent and T	rademark Office				

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

This action is issued in response to applicant amendment/ RCE filed 8/8/07.

Claims 1-56 were canceled. Claims 57-93 were amended. No claims were added.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/8/07 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Regarding Claims 57, 72, and 88, applicant argument with respect to the 112 2nd paragraph rejection is been accepted, therefore the 112 2nd paragraph rejection have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 57-93 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 2164

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Page 3

Claims 57, 72, and 88 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for "allocating, when at least one translatable component does not have corresponding translated component, at least a portion of the content for translation from the first language to a second language". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The step of allocating was not supported in the disclosure if instant application. Therefore the step of allocating will be interpreted with the broadest reasonable meaning in the database industry. The limitation will be addressed to the best of Examiner ascertain.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 65, 66, 70, 80, 81, and 86, recite the limitation "designating". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 67-69, and 85 recite the "step of replicating a sessions". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. It is unclear to examiner on how the claimed limitations of claims 67-69, and 85 are connected to claim 57 where they depend from. Therefore art will not be applied to claims 67-69, and 85 in this office action.

Art Unit: 2164

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 57-61, 63-66, 71-76, 78-84, and 87-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by Lakritz US Patent No. 7,207,005 filed Dec. 5, 2002 which is a continuation of US Patent No. 6,526,426 filed Jan 28, 1999.

Regarding Claims 57, 72, and 88, Lakritz, discloses a machine implemented method for synchronizing content in different languages, comprising the steps of:

accessing content in a first language (Col. 15, lines 9-11, Lakritz);

dividing the content into one or more translatable components (Col. 4, lines 61-65, Lakritz);

determining whether there exists at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component (Col. 5, lines 48-57, Lakritz); and

allocating, when at least one translatable component does not have a corresponding translated component, at least a portion of the content for translation from the first language to a second language Col. 5, lines 58-67, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 58, 73, and 89, Lakritz discloses a method further comprising the step of generating an identifier for each of the translatable components, wherein the

Art Unit: 2164

identifier is used in the step of determining each of the at least one translatable component (Col. 6, lines 6-14, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 59, 74, and 90, Lakritz discloses a method further comprising the step of adding the at least one translatable component and associated identifier to a translation list for translation into the second language (Col. 6, lines 14-18, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 60, 75, and 91, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the translation from the first language to the second language is by at least one of human translation and machine translation (Col. 11, lines 3-4, Lakritz).

Regarding Claim 61, 76, and 93, Lakritz discloses a method wherein each of the translatable components is at least one of:

a text segment;

an image file (Col. 20, lines 56-59, Lakritz);

an audio clip;

a video clip; and

a file.

Regarding claims 62, and 77, a method according to claim 61, wherein an identifier for a text segment is generated using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm based on one or more text segments (art will not be applied since the limitation in this claim is further limiting the text segment which was not addressed in claim 61).

Regarding Claim 63, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the step of determining is performed with respect to previously translated components in the second language

Art Unit: 2164

that are stored in association with their corresponding identifiers (Col. 20, lines 44-50, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 64, and 79, Lakritz discloses a method wherein:

the first language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German,

Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (Col. 20, lines 38-40, Lakritz);

the second language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German,

Portuguese, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (Col. 20, 40-43, Lakritz);

and

the second language is different from the first language (Col. 18, lines 42-58, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 65, and 80, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the designating comprises the step of adding a Universal Resource Locator (URL) associated with the at least a portion of the content to a translation list for translation (Col. 22, lines 13-19, Lakritz).

Regarding claims 67, and 81, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the designating comprises the step of adding the at least a portion of the content to a translation list for translation (Col. 29, lines 9-17, Lakritz).

Regarding Claims 70, and 86, a method according to claim 61, further comprising:

computing at least one of a hash code and a checksum for a file that is one of the first content containing markup tags and a file linked from the first content containing markup tags; and

determining that the at least one of the hash code and the checksum does not equal a previously computed at least one hash code and checksum that was computed for a previously processed file;

wherein the dividing, determining whether there exists a translatable component does not have a corresponding translated component, and designating are performed in response to the determining that the at least one of the hash code and the checksum does not equal a previously computed at least one hash code and checksum that was computed for a previously processed file (art will not be applied since the limitation in this claim is further limiting the file which was not addressed in claim 61).

Regarding Claim 71, and 87, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the dividing is based upon markup tags contained in the content in the first language (Col. 15, 16, lines 65-67, and 1-3 respectively, Lakritz).

Regarding Claim 92, Lakritz discloses a method wherein the information-processing portion is configured for retrieving the content in the first language from a web site (Col. 36, lines 61-67, Lakritz).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

2002/0065946 Narayan Synchronized computing with internet widgets.

2003/0140316 Lakritz translation management system.

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is 571-272-4013. The examiner can normally be reached on 8Am-4:30Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sana ∕AL-Hashemi

Primary Patent Examine Technology Center 2100

Art Unit: 2164

Art Unit 2164 October 22, 2007 Page 9